DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 627 FL 018 090

AUTHOR Greenberg, Gerald R.
TITLE Relativization and Subjacency in Russian.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 13p.; In: Proceedings of the Eastern States Conference on Linguistics (5th, Philadelphia, PA, Semptember 30-October 2, 1988). The complete Proceedings are available from the Department of Linguistics, Ohio State University, Columbus.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Contrastive Linguistics; English; *Grammar; *Grammatical Acceptability; Language Research; *Linguistic Theory; *Russian; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS Relative Clauses; *Relativization; *Subjacency

ABSTRACT

An analysis of subjacency in Russian focuses on relative clauses, and on the movement of the Russian pronoun "kotoryj." The properties of relativization in English are compared and contrasted with those in Russian, and a theory predating the formulation of bounding theory and the subjacency condition is tested with data from Russian. A newer formulation of subjacency, in terms of barriers, is found to account for more data. Varyng individual judgments of grammaticality are considered, and a set of conditions under which these variations may be accounted for is proposed. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309627

Relativization and Subjacency in Russian

by

Gerald R. Greenberg

from

Proceedings of the Fifth

EASTERN STATES CONFERENCE ON LINGUISTICS

University of Pennsylvania

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

September 30 - October 2, 1988

Joyce Powers and Kenneth de Jong
Editors
The Ohio State University

FL018090

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph, B.D.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ESCOL '88 187-197

RELATIVIZATION AND SUBJACENCY IN RUSSIAN*

Gerald R. Greenberg
Syracuse University

1. It has been suggested in popular general linguistics texts, cf. Radford 1981:237 and van Riemsdijk and Williams 1986:294, that long distance wh-movement is impossible in Russian, at least in certain types of clauses. Indeed, there is some question about the status of sentences like (1) and (2), and whether or not the **that-e* filter holds for Russian:

(1) Čto$_1$ ty skazal, čto ty videl t_1 ?
what you said that you saw
'What did you say that you saw?'

(2) Kto$_1$ ty skazal, čto t_1 prišel?
who you said that came
'Who did you say came?'

Some linguists claim this distinction exists, cf. Chvany 1975 and Pesetsky 1982, i.e., that (1) is grammatical and (2) is not, and therefore **that-e* holds. Other linguists, e.g. Comrie 1980, attribute a questionable status to sentences like (1). Part of the problem here is that spoken Russian differs greatly from the standard literary language. Strict adherence to the literary norms would rule out both (1) and (2), while some speakers would accept both in colloquial usage. Lapteva 1976 contains numerous examples from the spoken language that violate strict literary word order constraints, e.g. see (3), which although not a question, is in obvious violation of the **that-e* filter:

(3) Želtye$_1$ ja znaju čto t_1 byvajut.
yellow nom-3rd-pl I know that exist 3rd-pl
'Yellow, I know that (they) exist'

Due to this difficulty involving grammaticality judgements, I have restricted my analysis of Subjacency to relative clauses and the movement of the Russian relative pronoun *kotoryj*.

As Comrie 1980 points out, while restrictions on movement of the relative pronoun out of its own clause are stronger than on movement of a question word out of its clause, there is still nevertheless a certain amount of variation in individuals' intuitions. As it turns out, however, the variation involving relative clauses is actually predictable and yields even further justification for the following analysis.

2. At first glance, the properties of Relativization in Russian seem very similar to those of Relativization in English. The relative pronoun normally appears initially in the COMP node of its own clause and agrees with its antecedent in number and gender:

(4) * Boris byl dovolen kvartiroj, Tanja snjala kotoruju.
Boris was satisfied apartment Tanja rented which

(5) Boris byl dovolen kvartiroj, kotoruju$_1$ Tanja snjala t_1.
Boris was satisfied apartment which Tanja rented
f-sg-inst f-sg-acc
'Boris was satisfied with the apartment which Tanja rented'

As Comrie 1980 shows, however, Relativization in Russian is not quite as simple as it seems. The relative pronoun may actually be extracted from its own clause in certain constructions, giving rise to potential problems for the Subjacency Condition as stated in the LGB framework:

(6) Subjacency Condition: No rule can relate X, Y in the structure
... X ... [a ... [b ... Y ... (or: ... Y ...]b ...]a ... X
where a and b are bounding nodes.

The problem with respect to the extraction of the relative pronoun from its own clause is that there are three possible clause types: (A) those that allow extraction, (B) those which prohibit extraction, (C) those which some speakers feel allow extraction, but other speakers feel do not. Comrie's examples are provided with his informants' judgements indicated to the right of the example numbers given below: (+) good, (*) bad, (?) good for some, bad for others, or simply questionable. (C=judgements from Comrie's informants, G=judgements from my informants, see section 4 below.)

G C
+(7)+ Krepost', kotoruju$_1$ oni ne mogli vzjat' t_1, stojala
fortress which they not could to-take stood
na xolme.
on hill
'The fortress which they couldn't take stood on the hill'

G C
+(8)+ Krepost', [vzjat' kotoruju]$_1$ oni ne mogli t_1,
fortress to-take which they not could
stojala na xolme.
stood on hill
'The fortress which they couldn't take stood on the hill'

G C
+(9)+ ogurcy, kotorye$_1$ ja obeščal prinesti t_1.
cucumbers which I promised to-bring
'the cucumbers which I promised to bring'

G C
(10) ogurcy, kotorye $_1$ ja obeščal, čto prinesu t_1
cucumbers which I promised that (I-will)bring
'the cucumbers which I promised that I'd bring'

G C
(11) ty znaeš' muščinu, za kotorogo $_1$ ona ljubila Petju,
you know man for which she loved Peter
'prežde čem vyjti zamuž t_1?
before to-marry
'do you know the man whom she married and before that she loved Peter?'

G C
(12) kniga, kotoruju $_1$ on stal izvestnym avtorom,
book which he became famous author
napisav t_1
having-written
'the book, which he became a famous author, having written'

G C
(13) kniga, [napisav kotoruju] $_1$ on stal izvestnym
book having-written which he became famous
avtorom t_1
author
'the book, having written which, he became a famous author'

G C
*(14)? Policejskie okružili zdanie, kotoroe $_1$ on privez bombu,
police surrounded building which he brought bomb
čtoby vzorvat' t_1
in-order-to to-blow-up
'the police surrounded the building which he brought a bomb to blow up'

G C
*(15)? kniga, kotoruju $_1$ ja prikazal, čtoby on pročital t_1
book which I ordered in-order-to he read
'book, which I ordered him to read'

G C
(16) čelovek, kotoryj $_1$ nevozmožno, čtoby t_1 prišel
man which (it-is)impossible in-order-to came
'the man for whom it is impossible to come'

G	C						
?(17)*	ogurcy,	kotorye $_1$	mama	sprosila,	prinesu		t_1
	cucumbers	which	mama	asked	(will)bring		
		li	ja				
		Q-particle	I				

'cucumbers which mama asked if I'd bring'

In an effort to account for the wide variation of grammaticality judgements in sentences like (7)-(17), Comrie 1980:105 proposes that Russian has a general principle prohibiting the extraction of a relative pronoun out of an embedded clause. For this formulation to account for those sentences where extraction is possible, however, Comrie adds that the majority of Russians will allow exceptions to this principle. It is noteworthy to recall that Comrie's article was originally written and published in 1973, i.e. prior to the formulation of bounding theory and the Subjacency Condition, and therefore his proposed prohibition was essentially the Subjacency Condition, with both S and S' taken as bounding nodes for Russian. Recall this is what others have more recently proposed for Russian, see section 1 above.

3. We can now examine the relevant parts of the structures of (7)-(17) and see how well the Subjacency Condition as stated in (6) accounts for the data. During this part of our investigation we shall be referring to Comrie's informants' judgements. The structures in this section retain the original number of the example as found in section 2, but are differentiated from the latter by the mark ' following the example number.

(7') Krepost' [$_{S'}$[$_{COMP}$ kotoruju $_1$][$_S$ oni ne [$_{VP}$mogli [$_{S'}$[$_{COMP}$ t_1]
[$_S$PRO vzjat' t_1]]]]]

In (7') we see that the relative pronoun moves into COMP in the lowest clause, crossing only one S node; there is no Subjacency violation. In the next move, the relative pronoun crosses both S and S' in one move. If both S and S' were bounding nodes in Russian, then this sentence would be ungrammatical, but it is grammatical. Thus, based on (7'), it looks like either S or S' is a bounding node in Russian, but not both.

(8') Krepost' [$_{S'}$[$_{COMP}$ [PRO vzjat' kotoruju] $_1$][$_S$ oni ne mogli t_1]]

In (8') we see that the entire infinitival clause moves into COMP. Only one S node is crossed here and hence there is no Subjacency violation. This is substantiated by the grammaticality judgements, i.e., this sentence is grammatical.

(9') ogurcy [$_{S'}$[$_{COMP}$ kotorye $_1$][$_S$ ja [$_{VP}$ obeščal [$_{S'}$[$_{COMP}$ t_1]
[$_S$PRO prinesti t_1]]]]]

The derivation of (9') is like that of (7'); the relative pronoun moves into COMP crossing only one S node. When it moves into the higher COMP, it

crosses both S and S' in one move. The sentence is grammatical, so only one of these nodes can be a bounding node.

(10') ogurcy [S'[COMP kotorye $_1$][S ja [VPobeščal [S'[COMP čto]
[S prinesu t_1]]]]]

In (10') we find a wh-island violation, and the sentence is ungrammatical. We could rule out this sentence by claiming that *čto* does not license wh-movement into its COMP. If we do this, then the relative pronoun must cross two S nodes and one S' node in one move. Thus, there would be a Subjacency violation if S were a bounding node.

(11') mužčinu[S'[COMP za kotorogo $_1$][S ona [VPljubila Petju]
[S'[COMP prežde čem][S PRO vyjti zamuž t_1]]]]

The derivation of (11') is similar to that of (10'). If *prežde čem* does not license a wh-word in COMP, then the relative pronoun must cross two S nodes, causing a Subjacency violation.

(12') kniga[S'[COMP kotoruju $_1$][S on [VP stal izvestnym avtorom]
[S'[COMP t_1][S PRO napisav t_1]]]]

In (12'), the relative pronoun starts out in a gerund phrase, which is adverbial in Russian. It can move into its own COMP node and then into the upper COMP, without causing any Subjacency violation (assuming only S is a bounding node). Nevertheless, the sentence is ungrammatical.

(13') kniga [S'[COMP [S PRO napisav kotoruju] $_1$][S on [VP stal
izvestnym avtorom] t_1]]

In (13'), as in (8'), the Pied Piping effect occurs, i.e., the entire clause that contains the relative pronoun moves into the upper COMP. There is no Subjacency violation because only one S node is crossed, and the sentence is grammatical.

(14') zdanie [S'[COMP kotoroe $_1$][S on [VP privez bombu]
[S'[COMP čtoby][S PRO vzorvat' t_1]]]]

At first, (14') might seem the same as (10') and (11'), i.e., it has a complementizer in the COMP node. We might expect this complementizer not to license a wh-word in COMP, thus forcing the relative pronoun to move directly into the upper COMP and cross two S nodes with this move. However, this sentence is not as bad as (10) and (11). Thus, perhaps *čtoby* does allow a wh-word into its COMP. If this is the case, then the relative pronoun would not have

to cross two S nodes, and the sentence would not entail a Subjacency violation. We should keep in mind, however, that (14), while not totally ungrammatical, is somehow worse than the other grammatical sentences.

(15') kniga[s'[COMP kotoruju $_1$][S ja [VP prikazal[s'[COMP čtoby]
[S on pročital t_1]]]]]

The structure and grammatical status of (15') are similar to those of (14'). The sentence has the complementizer *čtoby* in the lower COMP and it is neither totally ungrammatical nor grammatical.

(16') čelovek [s'[COMP kotory] $_1$][S *e* nevozmožno [s'[COMP čtoby]
[S t_1 prišel]]]]

The structure of (16') is similar to the structures of (14') and (15'). As a result, we would expect it to have the same grammaticality status as (14) and (15), but we can see that it does not. Comrie's informants rule out this sentence, even though they do not rule out (14) and (15). Thus, there is some difficulty in dealing with *čtoby* in this analysis.

(17') ogurcy [s'[COMP kotorye $_1$][S mama [VP sprosila
[s'[COMP[prinesu t_1]$_j$][S li ja t_j]]]]]

Example (17') is the most problematic. *Li* is a question particle that appears in clause second position. The problem is that almost any type of element can precede *li*, i.e., a determiner or an adjective may be pulled out of a NP and placed before it. Thus, if COMP is restricted to containing only X^{max}, then it is not clear where these elements end up. As a result, this is a difficult construction to analyze in light of the crucial nature of S and S' in the formulation of the Subjacency Condition. However, even this construction can be accounted for in the discussion to follow.

4. In verifying these sentences, I received different grammaticality judgements from my informants than Comrie did from his. The judgements I was given are listed to the left of the example numbers (7)-(17) in section 2, i.e., Comrie's judgements are to the right of the example number, mine are to the left. These new grammaticality judgements do not differ greatly from Comrie's, and using the new classification still causes problems for an analysis that uses the Subjacency Condition as stated in (6). For example, all *čtoby* sentences (14)-(16) still do not have the same grammaticality classification. Furthermore, the problem with (9) and (12) still remains: in both (9) and (12) the relative pronoun crosses S and S' in one move, but only (12) is ungrammatical. Thus, the old formulation of the Subjacency Condition simply runs into trouble with the Russian data.

If we assume the newer formulation of Subjacency as stated in *Barriers*, however, we see that all of the data presented above are accounted for. As I stated

earlier, these sentences fall into one of three categories: (A) sentences that are good, (B) sentences that are bad, and (C) sentences that are good for some, bad for others, or just questionable, i.e. they are somewhere between (A) and (B) sentences on the acceptability continuum. This is exactly what we would predict using the formulation of the Subjacency Condition stated in terms of barriers, with an additional condition to be proposed below.

The central notion of bounding theory is now stated as:

(18) β is n-subjacent to α iff there are fewer than n+1 barriers for β that exclude α.

The best instance is when the antecedent and its trace are 0-subjacent, but a 1-subjacent chain is considered to be well-formed. What this means is that if something crosses *two or more* barriers, then the sentence will be bad. Thus, we will see shortly that in the (A)=good sentences, the relative pronoun does not cross two or more barriers, in the (B)=bad sentences, the relative pronoun crosses *at least* two barriers, and in the (C)=neither totally good nor bad, i.e. questionable, sentences are indeterminate for a special reason that I will present after the discussion of the good and bad sentences.

The definitions of barrier, blocking category, and L-marking are given below in (19)-(22). The notion of L-marking makes reference to θ-government:

(19) α θ-governs β iff α is a zero-level category that θ-marks β, and α, β are sisters.

(20) α L-marks β iff α is a lexical category that θ-governs β.

Blocking categories are then defined in terms of L-marking:

(21) γ is a blocking category for β if and only if γ is not L-marked and γ dominates β.

Finally, barriers are defined in terms of blocking categories:

(22) γ is a barrier for β if and only if (a) or (b):
  a. γ immediately dominates δ, δ a blocking category for β
  b. γ is a blocking category for β, $\gamma \neq$ IP.

Before returning to the relevant sentences, we must also assume the phrase structure rules of *Barriers* as well:

(23) a. $S = I'' = [\ NP\ [_{I'}[_{VP}\ V \ldots]]]$

b. $S' = C'' = [\ \ldots\ [_{C'}\ C\ I'']]$

We can now return to the sentences in question and see that this new formulation of Subjacency in terms of barriers correctly predicts their grammaticality status. The structures in this section retain the same number as the sentence to which they refer, followed by the mark ".

(7") Krepost' $[_{CP}$ kotoruju $_1$ $[_{IP}$ oni ne $[_{VP}\ t_1\ [\ _{VP}$ mogli $[_{CP}\ t_1$
$[_{IP}$ PRO $[_{VP}\ t_1\ [_{VP}$vzjat' $t_1]]]]]]]]]$

In (7"), the relative pronoun adjoins to its VP and then moves into the specifier slot of CP. The CP containing the infinitival phrase is L-marked by the verb *mogli* and therefore is not a barrier. Thus, the relative pronoun can move out of that CP phrase.

(8") Krepost' $[_{CP}\ [_{CP}$ PRO vzjat' kotoruju$]_1$ $[_{IP}$ oni ne $[_{VP}\ t_1$
$[_{VP}$ mogli $t_1\ ]]]]$

In (8"), the infinitival phrase adjoins to the VP containing *mogli* and then crosses the IP to move into the specifier of CP. Since IP is only a barrier by inheritance, this movement does not involve the crossing of a barrier, and the sentence is grammatical.

(9") ogurcy $[_{CP}$ kotorye $_1$ $[_{IP}$ ja $[_{VP}\ t_1\ [_{VP}$ obeščal $[_{CP}\ t_1$
$[_{IP}$ PRO $[_{VP}\ t_1\ [_{VP}$ prinesti $t_1\ ]]]]]]]]$

(9") is similar to (7"), i.e., *obeščal* L-marks the infinitival phrase, and therefore the relative pronoun may move out of the phrase, i.e., it crosses the CP that is L-marked and consequently not a barrier.

(10") ogurcy $[_{CP}$ kotorye $_1$ $[_{IP}$ ja $[_{VP}\ t_1\ [_{VP}$ obeščal $[_{CP}$ čto
$[_{IP}\ [_{VP}\ t_1\ [_{VP}$ prinesu $t_1\ ]]]]]]]]$

(10") requires a little extra attention. Chomsky 1986:37 notes that the most deeply embedded tensed IP in a sentence is an inherent (possibly weak) barrier to wh-movement in English. There is some type of parameter involved in this determination however, since in Italian, it is the most deeply embedded tensed CP that seems to be the extra barrier. This "extra barrier" is an additional barrier to the system described above. Returning to (10"), we see that unlike (7")-(9"), its most deeply embedded IP is indeed tensed. Therefore, this IP is a barrier. Tracing the relative pronoun's movements, we see it first adjoins to its VP. If we assume that the complementizer *čto* does not license the movement of the relative pronoun into the specifier of CP, then the relative pronoun must cross CP and move into the next clause. Since the most deeply

embedded tensed IP is this special 'extra' barrier, however, the CP dominating this IP is also a barrier by inheritance. Therefore, the relative pronoun crosses two barriers and causes a Subjacency violation.

(11") mužčinu [CP za kotorogo $_1$ [IP ona [VP ljubila Petju]
[CP prežde čem [IP PRO [VP t_1 [VP vyjti zamuž t_1]]]]]

In (11"), the infinitival CP with the complementizer *prežde čem* is an adverbial clause and therefore is not L-marked by the main verb. As a result, the CP that dominates the adverbial phrase is a barrier for the relative pronoun. Furthermore, the IP that dominates the adverbial CP phrase is also a barrier by inheritance. Thus, when the relative pronoun crosses its own CP and the IP that dominates the CP, it causes a Subjacency violation because it crosses two barriers. Note that the relative pronoun does not adjoin to the VP *ljubila Petju* because the infinitival CP is not embedded in that VP, but rather is a daughter to IP since it is a sentential adverbial.

(12") kniga[CP kotoruju $_1$ [IP on [VP stal izvestnym avtorom] [CP t_1
[IPPRO [VP t_1 [VP napisav t_1]]]]

The derivation of (12") is similar to that of (11"). As I mentioned above, gerundive phrases are adverbial in Russian. Thus, the CP containing the gerund phrase in (12") is not L-marked and consequently is a barrier. Additionally, the IP that dominates the adverbial CP is also a barrier. Thus, when the relative pronoun moves to the specifier slot of the upper CP, it crosses two barriers and causes a Subjacency violation. Once again, the relative pronoun does not adjoin to the upper VP because the gerund phrase is a daughter to IP.

(13") kniga [CP [CP PRO napisav kotoruju] $_1$ [IP on [VP stal
izvestnym avtorom] t_1]]

The movement in (13") does not result in a violation because the entire adverbial CP itself moves into the specifier slot of the upper CP. Since it cannot cross itself, it does not cross the initial barrier that causes the Subjacency violation in (12"), cf. Greenberg (in press) for a more detailed discussion of extraction from gerund phrases in Russian.

Up to this point we have seen that when the relative pronoun crosses two or more barriers, the sentence is not acceptable: (10)-(12). When the relative pronoun crosses less than two barriers, the sentence is acceptable: (7)-(9) and (13). There were no discrepancies between my informants and Comrie's concerning these sentences. (14)-(17) differ from the preceding ones, however, since they involve questionable grammaticality status, i.e., some speakers feel they are acceptable, others feel they are not, and still others feel they are somewhere between acceptable and not acceptable. Notice also, that these are the only sentences for which my informants' opinions differed from Comrie's. Upon careful inspection, we can see that these sentences do have

something in common that could be the cause of this indeterminate grammaticality status.

(14') zdanie [CP kotoroe $_1$ [IP on [VP privez bombu] [CP čtoby [IP PRO [VP t_1 [VP vzorvat' t_1]]]]]

(15') kniga [CP kotoruju $_1$ [IP ja [VP t_1 [VP prikazal [CP čtoby [IP on [VP t_1 [VP pročital t_1]]]]]

(16') čelovek [CP kotoryj $_1$ [IP e [VP t_1 [VP nevozmožno [CP čtoby [IP t_1 prišel]]]]

In (14)-(16), the common feature is fairly obvious, i.e., the sentences all contain the complementizer *čtoby* . This complementizer is the one that introduces irreal, hypothetical subordinate clauses. The verb form in these clauses is either the infinitive or the -l participle, which is the same as the past tense verb form in Russian, but it does not indicate past tense. In other words, the clauses introduced by *čtoby* are conditional or *subjunctive* . The subjunctive has had a relatively marginal status in GB theory, cf. Chomsky's 1981:230 fn. 73 remark about subjunctives in regard to binding theory: "...I have said nothing about subjunctives, a somewhat marginal construction in English that behaves in the manner of tensed clauses with regard to binding, though there is no overt AGR element. For the present, we must simply stipulate that there is a null AGR in English subjunctives."

Therefore, I propose that in addition to the most deeply embedded tensed IP being an "extra" barrier, the most deeply embedded subjunctive IP is also an extra, perhaps even weaker, barrier to wh-movement in Russian. This would make perfect sense. After all, the subjunctive is somehow more infinitival than the finite verb, and yet more finite than the infinitive. Thus, it would be natural to expect that its status in terms of barriers is somewhere between being a weak barrier and not being a barrier at all. The property of being a very weak barrier is reflected in the speakers' judgements: they are not sure whether the subjunctive clause should be a barrier or not and therefore they feel the sentence is questionable. Some speakers attribute a stronger barrierhood to the subjunctive and judge the sentences to be ungrammatical, while others do not treat it as a barrier at all and accept the sentences as grammatical.

As a result, sentences like (14)-(16) have an indeterminate status, regardless of whether the relative pronoun originates in an argument clause, e.g. (15), or a non-argument clause, e.g. (14). My informants treated the non-argument clauses as barriers, but the argument clauses as non-barriers. This is what we would expect, but further work on this topic is clearly called for. Furthermore, it is not clear whether the *čtoby* clause in (16) is in argument or non-argument position. Closer inspection of the variation between speakers might help in determining the structures of such constructions more precisely.

(17') ogurcy [CP kotorye $_1$][IP mama [VP t_1 [VP sprosila [CP[VP prinesu t_1]$_j$][IP li ja t_j]]]]]

The final sentence, (17), does not contain a *čtoby* clause, but it does contain an indirect question. Such clauses also have an irreal quality similar to that of subjunctive clauses. Therefore, I propose that indirect questions in Russian have the same status as subjunctive clauses in regard to the "extra" barrierhood of the most deeply embedded clause. Needless to say, it would be interesting to see how other languages pattern in this area.

5. In summary, if we adopt the definition of Subjacency in terms of barriers, accept the proposal that the most deeply embedded tensed IP is an additional barrier outside of the overall system of barriers, and that the most deeply embedded subjunctive clause (including indirect questions) is also an additional "very weak" barrier that is treated differently among speakers, then the wide fluctuation of judgements for sentences with extracted relative pronouns in Russian is entirely predictable.

FOOTNOTES

*I would like to thank Wayles Browne, Steven Franks, and Wayne Harbert for valuable comments on the contents of this paper; their suggestions contributed significantly to my investigation. Of course, I alone am responsible for any errors in this analysis.

REFERENCES

Chvany, C. 1975. On the syntax of BE-sentences in Russian. Columbus: Slavica Publishers, Inc.

Chomsky, N. 1981. Lectures on government and binding. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, N. 1986. Barriers. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Comrie, B. 1980. Clause structure and movement constraints in Russian. Morphosyntax in Slavic, ed. by C. Chvany and R. Brecht. Slavica Publishers, Inc., 98-113. (Originally in You take the high node and I'll take the low node, ed. by C. Corum, T.C. Smith-Stark, and A. Weiser. CLS 1973, 291-304.)

Greenberg, G. (in press). Developments in linguistic theory: The analysis of gerunds and infinitives in Russian. Folia Slavica 9 (=Memorial to V. A. Zvegintsev, ed. by C. V. Chvany, S. P. Dimitrova, and C. E. Gribble).

Pesetsky, D. 1982. Complementizer-trace phenomena and the nominative island constraint. The Linguistic Review 1.297-343.

Radford, A. 1981. Transformational syntax: a student's guide to Chomsky's extended standard theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rappaport, G. 1984. Grammatical function and syntactic structure: the adverbial participle of Russian. Columbus: Slavica Publishers, Inc.

Riemsdijk, H. C. van and E. Williams. 1986. Introduction to the theory of grammar. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.